INDONESIA

MCC Learning from

Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) Evaluation: Round 1 Report

Social Impact, July 2017

MCC has identified the following programmatic and evaluation lessons based on the Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) Evaluation: Round 1 Report.

PROGRAMMATIC LESSONS

- *PLUP's linkage to the rest of GP changed early in the compact. A program design or implementation change midway can create significant challenges both for ensuring and evaluating results.* PLUP was originally designed to lay a foundation of geospatial information to attract investment to targeted geographic areas and morphed into an approach to ensure that already-proposed investments were supported by geospatial information and follow safeguards. The economic argument for PLUP changed with this design change and the program logic had to be redefined. The implications of this fundamental change were not well understood across all team members. This posed challenges for ensuring a match between PLUP implementation (which had already been structured) and the achievement of newly defined results. Similarly, it created challenges for designing a relevant evaluation. More detailed thinking about the theory of change for standalone PLUP benefits may have prevented the risks to use of outputs and sustainability of results highlighted by the evaluation. Therefore, adequate consideration should be given to programmatic changes that affect the theory of change.
- *The significant investment by the Compact to ensure the achievement of PLUP targets may result in interventions that are too expensive for the government to take to scale*. MCA-I and MCC are considering ways to improve the efficiency of PLUP activities, based on the differing implementation models employed by the various PLUP implementers. The experience so far indicates that targeting local, rather than international, firms to manage PLUP implementation would have been a more cost-effective option.
- *More engagement with and dissemination of information to the districts is critical to making them leaders in geospatial data and planning and ensuring the sustainability of PLUP investments.* The project team had originally planned to pilot this kind of approach and then scale up across districts, but delays and challenges in contracting PLUP implementation, particularly given the complex and widespread geographic scope of the program, prevented it from doing so.